arXiv:1608.02394v1 [math.AG] 8 Aug 2016

Number of common roots and order of the resultant of tropical univariate polynomials

Hoon Hong
Department of Mathematics
North Carolina State University, USA

J. Rafael Sendra
Grupo ASYNACS,
Dpto. de Física y Matemáticas,
Universidad de Alcalá, 28871-Alcalá de Henares, Madrid, Spain

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a notion of order of a multivariate tropical polynomial at a point and we prove that the number of common roots of two tropical univariate polynomials, with simple and non-zero roots, is the order of the resultant (the permanent of the Sylvester matrix) at the tuple of coefficients of the given polynomials.

Keywords. Tropical linear algebra; Sylvester matrix; resultant; common roots; univariate polynomials.

MSC. 15A15, 15A80, 12K10.

1 Introduction

The main contribution of this paper is adapting a certain important property of univariate resultant over algebraically closed field to the tropical semifield. Below we elaborate on the above statement.

The resultant plays a crucial role in computational algebra and algebraic geometry [25, 21, 15, 6, 1, 7]. Let

$$A = \mathbf{a}_0 x^m + \mathbf{a}_1 x^{m-1} + \cdots + \mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{F}[\mathbf{a},x]$$
$$B = \mathbf{b}_0 x^n + \mathbf{b}_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + \mathbf{b}_n \quad \in \mathbb{F}[\mathbf{b},x]$$

be two polynomials in x over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$ with indeterminate coefficients $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ and $m, n \geq 1$. We recall that the resultant $R \in \mathbb{F}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]$ of A and B is defined as the determinant of a certain (Sylvester) matrix in the coefficients of A and B. We also recall the following two well known fundamental properties of resultants. Let $a \in \mathbb{F}^{m+1}$ and $b \in \mathbb{F}^{n+1}$ such that $a_0, b_0 \neq 0$. Then we have

P1. The point (a, b) is a root of the resultant R iff the two polynomials $A(a, x)$ and $B(b, x)$ have a common root.

P2. The order of the resultant R at the point (a, b) is the same as the number of common roots of the two polynomials $A(a, x)$ and $B(b, x)$.

The second property (P2) is, of course, a natural extension of the first property (P1).

The tropical semifield is the set $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ where the addition operation is defined as the usual maximum, the multiplication operation is defined as the usual addition. As a result, it does not allow subtraction (due

to lack of additive inverse; hence the name semifield). It has been intensively investigated due to numerous interesting applications [22, 20, 19, 11, 2, 9, 23, 12, 5, 24, 14, 4, 16, 10].

There have been several adaptations of resultant (over algebraically closed field) to the tropical semifield [17, 8, 3, 26, 18, 13]. In particular, Odagiri [18] showed that the above property P1 holds over the tropical semifield, if one redefines the notions of resultant and roots as follows: (1) the notation of resultant is redefined as the permanent of the Sylvester matrix. (2) the notion of root is redefined as a point where the graph of the polynomial is not smooth.

The main contribution of this paper is to show that the property P2 also holds over the tropical semifield, if one puts a slight restriction on (a, b) and one redefines the notion of order as follows: (1) we restrict (a, b) such that the polynomials $A(a, x)$ and $B(b, x)$ have only simple and non-zero roots. (2) the notion of the order of a multivariate polynomial C over a point p is redefined as the $\log_2$ of the numbers of terms, say t, in C such that $t(p) = C(p)$.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section2, we review some well-known concepts and results on tropical polynomials. In Section 3 we state formally the main result of the paper. In Section 5 we provide an informal overview of the proof. In Section 5 we provide a rigorous and detailed proof. In Section 6,we summarize the main result and discuss some potential generalizations and associated difficulties.

2 Review

In this section, we review some basic notations and notions on tropical semi-fields.

Definition 1 (Tropical semi-field)**.** *The* tropical semi-field *is the tuple* $(\mathbb{T}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, +, \times, /)$*, where* $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$*,* $+$ *is the usual maximum,* $\times$ *is the usual addition, and* $/$ *is the usual subtraction. The additive identity* $\mathbf{0}$ *is the usual* $-\infty$ *and the multiplicative identity* $\mathbf{1}$ *is the usual* 0*.*

Example 2. *Note*

$$\begin{array}{lll} 5+2=5 & 5\times 2=7 & 5\ /\ 2=3 \\ 5+\mathbf{0}=5 & 5\times \mathbf{1}=5 & 5\ /\ \mathbf{1}=5 \\ & 5\times \mathbf{0}=\mathbf{0} & \end{array}$$

Notation 3 (Tropical polynomial and function)**.** *Let* $\mathbb{T}[z]$ *be the set of all polynomials in the indeterminate* z*. Let* $C \in \mathbb{T}[z]$*. The polynomial* C *represents a function:* $\mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{T}$*.*

Example 4. *Let* $C_1 = 0z^3 + 2z^2 + 4z^1 + 5z^0 \in \mathbb{T}[z]$ *and* $C_2 = 0z^3 + 0z^2 + 4z^1 + 5z^0 \in \mathbb{T}[z]$*. Plots in Figure 1 show the functions represented by the polynomials.*



Figure 1: Plots of the functions represented by C_1 and C_2 in Example 4

In each plot, the red piecewise line is the graph of the polynomial (viewed as a function) and the four gray lines are the graphs of the terms in the polynomial. Note that C_1 and C_2 are different polynomials. But they represent the same function.

Definition 5 (Root and Multiplicity)**.** *Let $C \in \mathbb{T}[z]$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{T}$. We say that γ is a* root *of C if the graph of C has a corner over γ. The* multiplicity *of γ is the change in the slopes of the graph across γ. When the multiplicity of γ is one, we say that γ is* simple*.*

Example 6. *Consider the function represented by the polynomials C_1 and C_2 in Example 4. We see that 1 is a simple root (multiplicity 1) and that 2 is a non-simple root (multiplicity 2).*

Finally we recall the following well known facts without proofs.

Proposition 7. *Let $C = c_0x^d + c_1x^{d-1} + \cdots + c_d \in \mathbb{T}[x]$ where $c_0 \neq \mathbf{0}$. The roots of C and $\frac{1}{c_0}C$ are the same.*

Proposition 8. *Let $C = c_0x^d + c_1x^{d-1} + \cdots + c_d \in \mathbb{T}[x]$ be monic ($c_0 = \mathbf{1}$) with only simple roots $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2 > \cdots$. Then we have the followings.*

1. *C has exactly d roots.*
2. *$c_i = \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_i$.*

Remark 9. *Note that Proposition 8 implies that, under the assumptions of being monic and having all roots simple, a function has a unique polynomial representation; compare with Example 4.*

Example 10. *Let $C = \mathbf{1}z^3 + 4z^2 + 6z + 7$. The following plot (Figure 2) shows the function represented by the polynomial.*



Figure 2: Plots of the function defined by C in Example 4

We see that the roots are $\gamma_1 = 4$, $\gamma_2 = 2$, $\gamma_3 = 1$ and that they are all simple. Note

1. *C has exactly 3 roots.*
2. *$c_1 = 4 = \gamma_1$, $c_2 = 6 = 4 \cdot 2 = \gamma_1\gamma_2$, $c_3 = 7 = 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 = \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$*

3 Main Result

In this section, we will present the main result of this paper. For this, we need some notations and notions.

Definition 11 (Index and Order)**.** *Let $C \in \mathbb{T}[z_1, \ldots, z_l]$ be a non-***0** *polynomial. Let $C = t_1 + \cdots + t_r$ where t_i' s are terms in z with real (non-***0***) coefficients. Let $p \in \mathbb{T}^l$. Let $E_C(p) := \{t_i : C(p) = t_i(p)\}$. The* index *of p in C, written as $I_C(p)$, is defined by*

$$I_C(p) := \#E_C(p)$$

The order *of p in C, written as $O_C(p)$, is defined by*

$$O_C(p) := \log_2 I_C(p)$$

Example 12. *Let $C(z) = z_1 z_2 + 2z_1 + 2 \in \mathbb{T}[z]$. The plots in Figure 2 describe the graph of C. The left*



Figure 3: Polynomial C in Example 12

plot shows the function represented by C. The red piecewise plane is the graph of $C(z)$ and the three gray planes are the graphs of the terms in C. Let $t_1 = z_1 z_2$, $t_2 = 2z_1$, and $t_3 = 2$ be the terms in C. The right plot explicitly shows the partition of the z plane into pieces and the corresponding term for each piece. Table 1 shows the values of the index and the order on each piece.

$(p_1, p_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2$	color	$E(p)$	$I_C(p)$	$O_C(p)$
$t_1 = t_2 = t_3$	green	$\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$	3	$\log_2 3$
$t_1 = t_2 > t_3$	blue	$\{t_1, t_2\}$	2	1
$t_1 = t_3 > t_2$	blue	$\{t_1, t_3\}$	2	1
$t_2 = t_3 > t_1$	blue	$\{t_2, t_3\}$	2	1
$t_1 > t_2, t_3$	white	$\{t_1\}$	1	0
$t_2 > t_1, t_3$	white	$\{t_2\}$	1	0
$t_3 > t_1, t_2$	white	$\{t_3\}$	1	0

Table 1: Index and order in Example 12

Definition 13 (Resultant)**.** *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Let*

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_0 & \mathbf{a}_1 & \cdots & \cdots & \mathbf{a}_m & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & & \ddots & & \\ & & \mathbf{a}_0 & \mathbf{a}_1 & \cdots & \cdots & \mathbf{a}_m \\ \mathbf{b}_0 & \mathbf{b}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{b}_n & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \mathbf{b}_0 & \mathbf{b}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{b}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$R := \operatorname{per}(M) \in \mathbb{T}[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]$$

where $\mathbf{a}$ *and* $\mathbf{b}$ *are lists of indeterminates and where all the blanks are filled with* $\mathbf{0}$*.*

Example 14. *Let $m = 3$ and $n = 2$. Then*

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_0 & \mathbf{a}_1 & \mathbf{a}_2 & \mathbf{a}_3 & \\ & \mathbf{a}_0 & \mathbf{a}_1 & \mathbf{a}_2 & \mathbf{a}_3 \\ \mathbf{b}_0 & \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{b}_2 & & \\ & \mathbf{b}_0 & \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{b}_2 & \\ & & \mathbf{b}_0 & \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{b}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R := {} & \mathbf{a}_0^2\mathbf{b}_2^3 + \mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2^2 + \mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_2^2 + \mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{b}_1^2\mathbf{b}_2 + \mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2 + \mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_1^3 + \\ & \mathbf{a}_1^2\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_2^2 + \mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2 + \mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1^2 + \mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0^2\mathbf{b}_2 + \mathbf{a}_2^2\mathbf{b}_0^2\mathbf{b}_2 + \mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0^2\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{a}_3^2\mathbf{b}_0^3 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15 (Main Result)**.** *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} A &= a_0x^m + a_1x^{m-1} + \cdots + a_m \in \mathbb{T}[x], \quad a_0 \neq \mathbf{0} \\ B &= b_0x^n + b_1x^{n-1} + \cdots + b_n \quad \in \mathbb{T}[x], \quad b_0 \neq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

be with simple non-$\mathbf{0}$ *roots. Then the following two are equivalent:*

1. *A and B have exactly k common roots.*
2. *$O_R(a, b) = k$.*

Example 16. *We will illustrate the main result on a simple example. Let*

$$A = a_0x^3 + a_1x^2 + a_2x + a_3 \in \mathbb{T}[x]$$

be a monic polynomial with the roots $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \alpha_3 \neq \mathbf{0}$ and let

$$B(x) = b_0x^2 + b_1x + b_2 \in \mathbb{T}[x]$$

be a monic polynomial with the roots $\beta_1 > \beta_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$. From Proposition 8 we have

$$\begin{array}{llll} a_0 = \mathbf{1} & a_1 = \alpha_1 & a_2 = \alpha_1\alpha_2 & a_3 = \alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 \\ b_0 = \mathbf{1} & b_1 = \beta_1 & b_2 = \beta_1\beta_2 & \end{array}$$

Assume that

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \alpha_1 & & & \alpha_3 & \\ \| & > \alpha_2 > & & \| & \neq \mathbf{0} \\ \beta_1 & & & \beta_2 & \end{array}$$

Now we will verify the main result on this example. Note

Term	Value in roots	Value simplified
$\mathbf{a}_0^2\mathbf{b}_2^3$	$(\mathbf{1})^2(\beta_1\beta_2)^3$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_3^3$
$\mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2^2$	$(\mathbf{1})(\alpha_1)(\beta_1)(\beta_1\beta_2)^2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_3^2$
$\mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_2^2$	$(\mathbf{1})(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(\mathbf{1})(\beta_1\beta_2)^2$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2\alpha_3^2$
$\mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{b}_1^2\mathbf{b}_2$	$(\mathbf{1})(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(\beta_1)^2(\beta_1\beta_2)$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$
$\mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2$	$(\mathbf{1})(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3)(\mathbf{1})(\beta_1)(\beta_1\beta_2)$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2\alpha_3^2$
$\mathbf{a}_0\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_1^3$	$(\mathbf{1})(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3)(\beta_1)^3$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$
$\mathbf{a}_1^2\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_2^2$	$(\alpha_1)^2(\mathbf{1})(\beta_1\beta_2)^2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_3^2$
$\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2$	$(\alpha_1)(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(\mathbf{1})(\beta_1)(\beta_1\beta_2)$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$
$\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1^2$	$(\alpha_1)(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3)(\mathbf{1})(\beta_1)^2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$
$\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0^2\mathbf{b}_2$	$(\alpha_1)(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3)(\mathbf{1})^2(\beta_1\beta_2)$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2\alpha_3^2$
$\mathbf{a}_2^2\mathbf{b}_0^2\mathbf{b}_2$	$(\alpha_1\alpha_2)^2(\mathbf{1})^2(\beta_1\beta_2)$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2^2\alpha_3$
$\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0^2\mathbf{b}_1$	$(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3)(\mathbf{1})^2(\beta_1)$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2^2\alpha_3$
$\mathbf{a}_3^2\mathbf{b}_0^3$	$(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3)^2(\mathbf{1})^3$	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2\alpha_3^2$

Table 2: Value of each term of R, in Example 16, at the roots

1. *A and B have exactly 2 common roots, namely $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_3 = \beta_2$.*

2. *Table 2 shows the value of each term in R. In the last column of Table 2, we simplified the value using the fact that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_3 = \beta_2$, for the sake of easier comparison among the values. One can straightforwardly verify that $\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$ is the maximum among the values. Thus $R(a,b) = \alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$ (marked in red in Table 2). Hence the corresponding terms are given by*

$$E_R(a,b) = \{\mathbf{a_0a_2b_1^2b_2},\ \mathbf{a_0a_3b_1^3},\ \mathbf{a_1a_2b_0b_1b_2},\ \mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_0\mathbf{b}_1^2\}$$

Thus $I_R(a,b) = 2^2$ and $O_R(a,b) = 2$.

We have verified the main result on this example.

4 Informal Overview of Proof

In this section, before plunging into the technically detailed and rigorous proof (given in Section 5), we provide an informal overview of the main result and a general proof strategy.

Main result

First we recall the main result that we are trying to prove. For this, let us recall some notions and notations.

- We identify any univariate polynomial with its tuple of coefficients.
- We consider two generic polynomials, one of degree m and the other of degree n; that is, we consider two tuple of variable $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ of lengths $m+1$ and $n+1$ respectively. Then, we take the permanent of the Sylvester matrix associated with them, that is a multivariate polynomial $R(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$ in the variables $\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}$.
- We consider two particular polynomials A and B of the prescribed degrees (i.e. two particular tuples a,b of lengths $m+1$ and $n+1$, respectively), satisfying that all their roots are simple and non-zero.

Our goal is to prove the following main result: the number of the terms in $R(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$ which, specialized at (a,b), are equal to $R(a,b)$ is exactly 2^k, where k is the number of common roots of the two given polynomials.

General proof strategy

Note that each term in $R(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ comes from one or more permutations of $(1, \ldots, n+m)$. Thus we focus our attention to the permutations. Let S be the set of all the permutations. Then, the main steps of the proof consist of the followings.

1. Lemma 17: We "restrict"the proof to the case of monic polynomials, without losing generality.
2. Lemma 29: We "prune" the set S, obtaining S^*, by removing all the permutations that never yields $R(a, b)$, no matter what a and b are. Note that some permutations in S^* might not yield $R(a, b)$.
3. Lemma 35: We "characterize" the permutations in S^* that yield $R(a, b)$, in terms of the ordering among the roots of A and B.
4. Lemma 39: We show that the number of permutation in the previous step is exactly 2^k.
5. Lemma 40: We show that each permutation in S^* provides a different term in $R(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$.

The main result is immediate from the above lemmas.

5 Proof

In this section, we provide a detailed proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A &= a_0 x^m + a_1 x^{m-1} + \cdots + a_m \in \mathbb{T}[x], \ a_0 \neq \mathbf{0} \\ B &= b_0 x^n + b_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + b_n \quad \in \mathbb{T}[x], \ b_0 \neq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

be with simple non-$\mathbf{0}$ roots. The next lemma, together with Proposition 7, will be used to reduced the proof to the monic polynomial case.

Lemma 17. *Let $a = (a_0, \ldots, a_m)$ and $b = (b_0, \ldots, b_m)$ where $a_0, b_0 \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then $O_R(a, b) = O_R\left(\frac{1}{a_0}a, \frac{1}{b_0}b\right)$.*

Proof. Let R be expressed as $R = t_1 + \cdots + t_\rho$ where t_i are terms in $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ with non-$\mathbf{0}$ coefficients. We observe that R is bi-homogeneous of degrees n and m in the variables $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$, respectively. Thus for each term t_i we have

$$a_0^m b_0^n \ t_i\left(\frac{1}{a_0}a, \frac{1}{b_0}b\right) \ = \ t_i(a, b).$$

Now, the lemma follows immediately from the definition of order. □

Therefore, taking into account of Proposition 7 and Lemma 17, we can restrict the proof of the main result to the monic case, without losing generality. Thus, in the following, we assume that A, B are monic; that is $a_0 = \mathbf{1} = b_0$. In addition, let $\alpha_1 > \cdots > \alpha_m$ be the roots of A and $\beta_1 > \cdots > \beta_n$ be the roots of B. From Proposition 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_i &= \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_i \\ b_i &= \beta_1 \cdots \beta_i \end{aligned}$$

Note that, since $\alpha_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\beta_j \neq \mathbf{0}$, we see that $a_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $b_j \neq \mathbf{0}$. We will set $a_i = \mathbf{0}$ if $i > m$ or $i < 0$ and set $b_i = \mathbf{0}$ if $i > n$ or $i < 0$. Let

$$A := [a_{j-i}] = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & \cdots & a_m & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ & & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & \cdots & a_m \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{T}^{n \times (n+m)}$$

$$B := [b_{j-i}] = \begin{bmatrix} b_0 & b_1 & \cdots & b_n & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ & & & b_0 & b_1 & \cdots & b_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{T}^{m\times(n+m)}$$

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} A \\ B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{T}^{(n+m)\times(n+m)}$$

$$R := \operatorname{per}(M)$$

Notation 18. *Let S stand for the set of all permutations of $(1,\ldots,n+m)$.*

Example 19. *Let $m=3$ and $n=2$. Then S is the set of all permutations of $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$. Note*

$$\#S = (n+m)! = (2+3)! = 120.$$

Notation 20. *For $\pi \in S$, let $M_\pi := M_{1,\pi_1}\cdots M_{n+m,\pi_{n+m}}$.*

Example 21. *Let $m=3$ and $n=2$. Let $\pi=(1,4,3,2,5)$. It represents the following choice of elements ("path") marked in red color:*

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \\ & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & & \\ & b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & \\ & & b_0 & b_1 & b_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence

$$M_\pi = a_0 a_2 b_2 b_0 b_2.$$

Lemma 22. *Let $\pi=(\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_n,\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m)\in S$. Then*

$$M_\pi = a_{\nu_1-1}\cdots a_{\nu_n-n}\ b_{\mu_1-1}\cdots b_{\mu_m-m}$$

Proof. Obvious from "shifting" structure of the matrix M. □

Example 23. *Let $m=3$ and $n=3$. Let $\pi=(1,4,3,2,5)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} M_\pi &= a_{1-1}\ a_{4-2}\ b_{3-1}\ b_{2-2}\ b_{5-3} \\ &= a_0 a_2 b_2 b_0 b_2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 24. $R = \sum_{\pi\in S} M_\pi$.

Proof. Obvious from the definition of permanent. □

Lemma 25 (Odagiri 2008, [18])**.** *Let $\pi=(\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_n,\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m)\in S$ be such that $M_\pi \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then we have the followings.*

1. *Suppose that $\nu_k > \nu_{k+1}$ for some k. Let $\pi' := (\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_{k+1},\nu_k,\ldots,\nu_n,\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m)$, that is, obtained from π by swapping ν_k and ν_{k+1}. Then $M_{\pi'} > M_\pi$.*
2. *Suppose that $\mu_k > \mu_{k+1}$ for some k. Let $\pi' := (\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_n,\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_{k+1},\mu_k,\ldots,\mu_m)$, that is, obtained from π by swapping μ_k and μ_{k+1}. Then $M_{\pi'} > M_\pi$.*

Example 26. *Let $m = 3$ and $n = 3$. Let*

$$\pi = (1, 4, 3, 2, 5) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi' = (1, 4, 2, 3, 5)$$

They represent the following choices of elements ("path") marked in red color:

$$\pi : \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \\ & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & & \\ & b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & \\ & & b_0 & b_1 & b_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi' : \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \\ & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & & \\ & b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & \\ & & b_0 & b_1 & b_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Note

$$\frac{M_{\pi'}}{M_\pi} = \frac{a_0 a_2 b_1 b_1 b_2}{a_0 a_2 b_2 b_0 b_2} = \frac{b_1 b_1}{b_2 b_0} = \frac{(\beta_1)\,(\beta_1)}{(\beta_1 \beta_2)\,(\mathbf{1})} = \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} > \mathbf{1}$$

Thus

$$M_{\pi'} > M_\pi$$

verifying the lemma on π and π'. Observe that π has a "zigzag" in the bottom part, while π' does not have a zigzag. The lemma says that a zigzag makes the value of a path smaller.

Proof of Lemma 25. The proof was given in [18]. However for the sake of reader's convenience and the notational consistency, we provide a complete proof here. We will show the proof of the claim 1 only. The proof for the claim 2 is essentially the same. Note

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_{\pi'}}{M_\pi} &= \frac{a_{\nu_1 - 1} \cdots a_{\nu_{k+1} - k}\ a_{\nu_k - (k+1)} \cdots a_{\nu_n - n}\ b_{\mu_1 - 1} \cdots b_{\mu_m - m}}{a_{\nu_1 - 1} \cdots a_{\nu_k - k}\ a_{\nu_{k+1} - (k+1)} \cdots a_{\nu_n - n}\ b_{\mu_1 - 1} \cdots b_{\mu_m - m}} \\ &= \frac{a_{\nu_{k+1} - k}\ \ a_{\nu_k - (k+1)}}{a_{\nu_k - k}\ \ a_{\nu_{k+1} - (k+1)}} \\ &= \frac{a_{\nu_{k+1} - (k+1)}\ \alpha_{\nu_{k+1} - k}\ \ a_{\nu_k - (k+1)}}{a_{\nu_k - (k+1)}\ \alpha_{\nu_k - k}\ \ a_{\nu_{k+1} - (k+1)}} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_{\nu_{k+1} - k}}{\alpha_{\nu_k - k}} \\ &> \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $M_{\pi'} > M_\pi$. □

Notation 27. *Let S^* stand for the set of all $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n, \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) \in S$ such that $\nu_1 < \cdots < \nu_n$ and $\mu_1 < \cdots < \mu_m$.*

Example 28. *Let $m = 3$ and $n = 2$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} S^* = \{\ & (1,2,\ \ 3,4,5), \quad (1,3,\ \ 2,4,5), \quad (1,4,\ \ 2,3,5), \quad (1,5,\ \ 2,3,4), \\ & (2,3,\ \ 1,4,5), \quad (2,4,\ \ 1,3,5), \quad (2,5,\ \ 1,3,4), \\ & (3,4,\ \ 1,2,5), \quad (3,5,\ \ 1,2,4), \\ & (4,5,\ \ 1,2,3)\ \} \end{aligned}$$

Note

$$\#S^* = \frac{(n+m)!}{n!m!} = \frac{(2+3)!}{2!3!} = 10.$$

Lemma 29. *If $\pi \in S \setminus S^*$, then $R > M_\pi$.*

Proof. Let $\pi \in S \setminus S^*$. Recall that $R = \prod_{ij} (\alpha_i + \beta_j)$. Since $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$ are non-$\mathbf{0}$, we have $R \neq \mathbf{0}$. Suppose that $M_\pi = \mathbf{0}$. Then we obviously have $R > M_\pi$. Thus from now on, assume that $M_\pi \neq \mathbf{0}$. Note

$$R = \sum_{\rho \in S} M_\rho = \sum_{\rho \in S \setminus \{\pi\}} M_\rho + M_\pi$$

From Lemma 25, we have $\pi' \in S \setminus \{\pi\}$ such that $M_{\pi'} > M_\pi$. Hence $R > M_\pi$. □

Lemma 30. $R = \sum_{\pi \in S^*} M_\pi$.

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 24 and 29. □

Lemma 31. *Let $\pi = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n, \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) \in S^*$. Let $p_i = n - (\mu_i - i)$ and $q_i = m - (\nu_i - i)$. Then we have*

$$M_\pi = \alpha^p \beta^q$$

Example 32. *Let us $m = 3$ and $n = 2$. Let $\pi = (1, 4,\ 2, 3, 5) \in S^*$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
M_\pi &= a_{1-1}\ a_{4-2}\ \ b_{2-1}\ b_{3-2}\ b_{5-3} \\
&= a_0 a_2 b_1 b_1 b_2 \\
&= (\mathbf{1})(\alpha_1\alpha_2)(\beta_1)(\beta_1)(\beta_1\beta_2) \\
&= \alpha_1^1 \alpha_2^1 \alpha_3^0 \beta_1^3 \beta_2^1 \\
\alpha^p \beta^q &= \alpha_1^{2-(2-1)} \alpha_1^{2-(3-2)} \alpha_1^{2-(5-3)} \beta_1^{3-(1-1)} \beta_1^{3-(4-2)} \\
&= \alpha_1^1 \alpha_1^1 \alpha_1^0 \beta_1^3 \beta_1^1
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $M_\pi = \alpha^p \beta^q$, verifying the lemma on the particular π.

Proof of Lemma 31. There are two cases: $\mu_1 = 1$ or $\nu_1 = 1$. We will show a proof of the lemma only for the case $\mu_1 = 1$. The proof for the case $\nu_1 = 1$ is essentially the same. We will divide the proof into two steps.

1. Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots$ be the lengths of the consecutive blocks in μ. Likewise let $t_1, t_2, \ldots$ be the lengths of the consecutive blocks in ν. Then

   $$\begin{aligned}
   \mu &= (1, \ldots, s_1, \quad s_1 + t_1 + 1, \ldots, s_1 + t_1 + s_2, \quad s_1 + t_1 + s_2 + t_2 + 1, \ldots, s_1 + t_1 + s_2 + t_2 + s_3, \quad \ldots) \\
   \nu &= (s_1 + 1, \ldots, s_1 + t_1, \quad s_1 + t_1 + s_2 + 1, \ldots, s_1 + t_1 + s_2 + t_2, \quad \ldots)
   \end{aligned}$$

   Let $\overline{\mu}_j = \mu_j - j$ and $\overline{\nu}_i = \nu_i - i$. Then

   $$\begin{aligned}
   \bar{\mu} &= (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{s_1}, \quad \underbrace{t_1, \ldots, t_1}_{s_2}, \quad \underbrace{t_1 + t_2, \ldots, t_1 + t_2}_{s_3}, \quad \ldots) \\
   \bar{\nu} &= (\underbrace{s_1, \ldots, s_1}_{t_1}, \quad \underbrace{s_1 + s_2, \ldots, s_1 + s_2}_{t_2}, \quad \ldots)
   \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

2. Note

   $$\begin{aligned}
   M_\pi &= a_{\overline{\nu}_1} a_{\overline{\nu}_2} \cdots b_{\overline{\mu}_1} b_{\overline{\mu}_2} \cdots \\
   &= a_{s_1}^{t_1} a_{s_1+s_2}^{t_2} \cdots b_{t_1}^{s_2} b_{t_1+t_2}^{s_3} \cdots \qquad \text{from (1) and the fact that } b_0 = 1 \\
   &= \prod_{k=1}^{s_1} \alpha_k^{t_1} \prod_{k=1}^{s_1+s_2} \alpha_k^{t_2} \cdots \prod_{k=1}^{t_1} \beta_k^{s_2} \prod_{k=1}^{t_1+t_2} \beta_k^{s_3} \cdots \\
   &= \prod_{k=1}^{s_1} \alpha_k^{t_1+t_2+\cdots} \prod_{k=s_1+1}^{s_1+s_2} \alpha_k^{t_2+t_3+\cdots} \cdots \prod_{k=1}^{t_1} \beta_k^{s_2+s_3+\cdots} \prod_{k=t_1+1}^{t_1+t_2} \beta_k^{s_3+s_4+\cdots} \cdots
   \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \prod_{k=1}^{s_1} \alpha_k^{n-0} \prod_{k=s_1+1}^{s_1+s_2} \alpha_k^{n-t_1} \cdots \prod_{k=1}^{t_1} \beta_k^{m-s_1} \prod_{k=t_1+1}^{t_1+t_2} \beta_k^{m-(s_1+s_2)} \cdots \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{s_1} \alpha_k^{n-\bar{\mu}_k} \prod_{k=s_1+1}^{s_1+s_2} \alpha_k^{n-\bar{\mu}_k} \cdots \prod_{k=1}^{t_1} \beta_k^{m-\bar{\nu}_k} \prod_{k=t_1+1}^{t_1+t_2} \beta_k^{m-\bar{\nu}_k} \cdots \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{m} \alpha_k^{n-\bar{\mu}_k} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \beta_k^{m-\bar{\nu}_k} \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{m} \alpha_k^{p_k} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \beta_k^{q_k} \\
&= \alpha^p \beta^q
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Notation 33. *For $\pi = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n, \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) \in S$, let $\gamma^\pi \in \mathbb{T}^{n+m}$ be such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma^\pi_{\nu_i} &= \beta_i \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n \\
\gamma^\pi_{\mu_i} &= \alpha_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m
\end{aligned}
$$

When not confusing, we will write γ instead of γ^π.

Example 34. *Let us $m = 3$ and $n = 2$. Let $\pi = (1, 4, \quad 2, 3, 5) \in S^*$. Then*

$$
\gamma^\pi = (\beta_1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \alpha_3)
$$

Lemma 35. *Let $\pi \in S$. The followings are equivalent*

1. *$\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}$.*
2. *$R = M_\pi$.*

Example 36. *We illustrate the lemma using Example 16, that is, $m = 3$ and $n = 2$ and*

$$
\begin{matrix} \alpha_1 \\ \| \\ \beta_1 \end{matrix} > \alpha_2 > \begin{matrix} \alpha_3 \\ \| \\ \beta_2 \end{matrix} \neq \mathbf{0}
$$

For $\pi \in S \backslash S^*$, it is easy to check that both 1 and 2 are false and thus the lemma is verified. For $\pi \in S^*$, Table 3 verifies the lemma: In the 3rd and the 6th columns, we simplified the previous columns using the fact that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_3 = \beta_2$, for the sake of easier checks in the next columns.

Proof of Lemma 35. We divide the proof into two cases: $\pi \in S \setminus S^*$ and $\pi \in S^*$.

Case 1: $\pi \in S \setminus S^*$. For some $i < j$, we have $\nu_i > \nu_j$ or $\mu_i > \mu_j$. Recall that $\gamma^\pi_{\nu_i} = \beta_i$, $\gamma^\pi_{\nu_j} = \beta_j$, $\gamma^\pi_{\mu_i} = \alpha_i$ and $\gamma^\pi_{\mu_j} = \alpha_j$. Since $\beta_i > \beta_j$ and $\alpha_i > \alpha_j$, we have $\gamma^\pi_{\nu_i} > \gamma^\pi_{\nu_j}$ or $\gamma^\pi_{\mu_i} > \gamma^\pi_{\mu_j}$. Thus the statement $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}$ is false. From Lemma 29, the statement $R = M_\pi$ is also false. Thus the lemma is vacuously true.

Case 2: $\pi \in S^*$. We prove each direction of implication one at a time:

1. If $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}$ then $R = M_\pi$.

   Assume that $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}$. We need to show $R = M_\pi$. By Corollary 30

$$
R = \sum_{\pi' \in S^*} M_{\pi'}
$$

$\pi \in S^*$	γ^π	γ^πsimplified	$\gamma_1 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_5$	M_π	$M_\pi$simplified	$R = M_\pi$
$(1,2,\ 3,4,5)$	$(\beta_1,\beta_2,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_3,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$	false	$\beta_1^3\beta_2^3$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_3^3$	false
$(1,3,\ 2,4,5)$	$(\beta_1,\alpha_1,\beta_2,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_3,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$	false	$\alpha_1\beta_1^3\beta_2^2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_3^2$	false
$(1,4,\ 2,3,5)$	$(\beta_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta_2,\alpha_3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_3)$	true	$\alpha_1\alpha_2\beta_1^3\beta_2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$	true
$(1,5,\ 2,3,4)$	$(\beta_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\beta_2)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_3)$	true	$\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta_1^3$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$	true
$(2,3,\ 1,4,5)$	$(\alpha_1,\beta_1,\beta_2.\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_3.\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$	false	$\alpha_1^2\beta_1^2\beta_2^2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_3^2$	false
$(2,4,\ 1,3,5)$	$(\alpha_1,\beta_1,\alpha_2,\beta_2,\alpha_3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_3)$	true	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2\beta_1^2\beta_2$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$	true
$(2,5,\ 1,3,4)$	$(\alpha_1,\beta_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\beta_2)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_3)$	true	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2\beta_1^2\alpha_3$	$\alpha_1^4\alpha_2\alpha_3$	true
$(3,4,\ 1,2,5)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta_1,\beta_2,\alpha_3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_1,\alpha_3,\alpha_3)$	false	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2\beta_1\beta_2$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2^2\alpha_3$	false
$(3,5,\ 1,2,4)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta_1,\alpha_3.\beta_2)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_1,\alpha_3.\alpha_3)$	false	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2\beta_1\alpha_3$	$\alpha_1^3\alpha_2^2\alpha_3$	false
$(4,5,\ 1,2,3)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\beta_1,\beta_2)$	$(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_1,\alpha_3)$	false	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2\alpha_3^2$	$\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2\alpha_3^2$	false

Table 3: Verification of Lemma 35 in Example 36

Let $\pi' = (\nu'_1,\ldots,\nu'_n,\mu'_1,\ldots,\mu'_m) \in S^*$ be such that $\pi' \neq \pi$. It suffices to show that $M_\pi \geq M_{\pi'}$. If $M_{\pi'} =$ then it is obvious true. Thus from now on, assume that $M_{\pi'} \neq$. Note, by Lemma 31,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{M_\pi}{M_{\pi'}} &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{n-(\mu_i-i)} \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_i^{m-(\nu_i-i)}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{n-(\mu'_i-i)} \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_i^{m-(\nu'_i-i)}} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{\mu_{i'}} \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_i^{\nu'_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^{\mu_i} \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_i^{\nu_i}} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \gamma_{\mu_i}^{\mu'_i} \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_{\nu_i}^{\nu'_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \gamma_{\mu_i}^{\mu_i} \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_{\nu_i}^{\nu_i}} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n+m} \gamma_j^{\lambda_j}}{\prod_{j=1}^{n+m} \gamma_j^{j}} \qquad \text{where } \lambda \in S \text{ such that } \lambda_{\mu_i} := \mu'_i \text{ and } \lambda_{\nu_i} := \nu'_i \\
&\geq \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $M_\pi \geq M_{\pi'}$.

2. If $R = M_\pi$ then $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}$.

   We will prove the contrapositive. Assume that it is false that $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}$. We need to show that $R > M_\pi$. Let k be such that $\gamma_k < \gamma_{k+1}$. Let i and j such that $k = \pi_i$ and $k+1 = \pi_j$. We consider the following four potential cases.

   (a) $i \leq n$ and $j \leq n$

   Note that π has the following form

$$\pi = (\nu,\mu) = (\underbrace{\ldots,k,k+1,\ldots}_{n}\ \underbrace{\ldots\ldots}_{m})$$

   where k appears at the i-th position and $k+1$ appears at the j-th position (in fact, j must be $i+1$, since $\pi \in S^*$) in the ν block. Thus $\gamma_k = \beta_i$ and $\gamma_{k+1} = \beta_j$. Since $\gamma_k < \gamma_{k+1}$, we should have $\beta_i < \beta_j$. However this is not possible due to the global assumption $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \beta_n$. Thus this case cannot occur.

   (b) $i > n$ and $j > n$

   This case cannot occur, due to the essentially same reason as above.

(c) $i \leq n$ and $j > n$

We divide the proof into several steps.

i. Note that π has the following form

$$\pi = (\nu, \mu) = (\underbrace{\ldots, k, \ldots}_{n} \underbrace{\ldots, k+1, \ldots}_{m})$$

where k appears on the i-th position in the ν block and $k+1$ appears on the $(j-n)$-th position in the μ block.

ii. Note $\gamma_k = \beta_i$ and $\gamma_{k+1} = \alpha_{j-n}$. Since $\gamma_k < \gamma_{k+1}$, we have $\beta_i < \alpha_{j-n}$.

iii. Let π' be obtained from π by swapping π_i and π_j. Then π' has the following form

$$\pi' = (\nu', \mu') = (\underbrace{\ldots, k+1, \ldots}_{n} \underbrace{\ldots, k, \ldots}_{m})$$

where $k+1$ appears on the i-th position in the ν' block and k appears on the $(j-n)$-th position in the μ' block.

iv. We will show that $\pi' \in S^*$. Since $\pi \in S^*$, we have that ν and μ are strictly increasing. By inspecting the form of π shown above, we see that, in the ν block, everything to the left of k is less then k and everything to the right of k is greater than $k+1$ and that, in the μ block, everything to the left of $k+1$ is less than k and everything to the right of $k+1$ is greater than $k+1$. By inspecting the form of π' shown above, we see that ν' and μ' are strictly increasing. Thus $\pi' \in S^*$.

v. From Lemma 31, we have

$$\frac{M_{\pi'}}{M_\pi} = \frac{\cdots \alpha_{j-n}^{n-(k-(j-n))} \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \beta_i^{m-(k+1-i)} \cdots}{\cdots \alpha_{j-n}^{n-(k+1-(j-n))} \cdots \quad \cdots \beta_i^{m-(k-i)} \quad \cdots} = \frac{\alpha_{j-n}}{\beta_i} > \mathbf{1}$$

Thus $M_{\pi'} > M_\pi$. Thus $R > M_\pi$.

(d) $i > n$ and $j \leq n$

We can show that $R > M_\pi$, using the essentially same argument as above.

□

Notation 37. *Let* $N_R = \#\{\pi \in S : R = M_\pi\}$, *i.e. the number of "maximum permutations"*

Lemma 38. *If A and B have exactly k common roots, then* $N_R = 2^k$.

Proof. Let A and B be of degrees m and n with exactly k common roots, say $\alpha_{i_1} = \beta_{j_1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i_k} = \beta_{j_k}$ where the roots α's and β's are ordered as follows.

$$\cdots > \begin{matrix}\alpha_{i_1} \\ \| \\ \beta_{j_1}\end{matrix} > \cdots > \begin{matrix}\alpha_{i_1} \\ \| \\ \beta_{j_1}\end{matrix} > \cdots\cdots > \begin{matrix}\alpha_{i_k} \\ \| \\ \beta_{j_k}\end{matrix} > \cdots \tag{2}$$

where $\cdots$ represent strict orderings among the other (non-common) roots. Note

$$\begin{aligned} N_R &= \#\{\pi \in S : R = M_\pi\} \\ &= \#\left\{\pi \in S : \gamma_1^\pi \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_{n+m}^\pi\right\} \quad \text{from Lemma 35} \\ &= \#\left\{\pi \in S : \gamma^\pi = \left(\cdots, \begin{matrix}\alpha_{i_1}, \beta_{j_1} \\ \beta_{j_1}, \alpha_{i_1}\end{matrix}, \cdots, \begin{matrix}\alpha_{i_2}, \beta_{j_2} \\ \beta_{j_2}, \alpha_{i_2}\end{matrix}, \cdots\cdots, \begin{matrix}\alpha_{i_k}, \beta_{j_k} \\ \beta_{j_k}, \alpha_{i_k}\end{matrix}, \cdots\right)\right\} \quad \text{from (2)} \end{aligned}$$

(where $\begin{matrix}\square\\ \triangle\end{matrix}$ means "either $\square$ or $\triangle$")

$$= \#\left\{\pi = (\nu,\mu) \in S : \gamma^\pi = \begin{pmatrix} \cdots, & \gamma^\pi_{\mu_{i_1}}, \gamma^\pi_{\nu_{j_1}} & , \cdots, & \gamma^\pi_{\mu_{i_2}}, \gamma^\pi_{\nu_{j_2}} & , \cdots\cdots, & \gamma^\pi_{\mu_{i_k}}, \gamma^\pi_{\nu_{j_k}} & , \cdots \\ & \gamma^\pi_{\nu_{j_1}}, \gamma^\pi_{\mu_{i_1}} & & \gamma^\pi_{\nu_{j_2}}, \gamma^\pi_{\mu_{i_2}} & & \gamma^\pi_{\nu_{j_k}}, \gamma^\pi_{\mu_{i_k}} & \end{pmatrix}\right\}$$

$$= \#\left\{\pi = (\nu,\mu) \in S : \begin{pmatrix} \cdots, & \mu_{i_1}, \nu_{j_1} & , \cdots, & \mu_{i_2}, \nu_{j_2} & , \cdots\cdots, & \mu_{i_k}, \nu_{j_k} & , \cdots \\ & \nu_{j_1}, \mu_{i_1} & & \nu_{j_2}, \mu_{i_2} & & \nu_{jk}, \mu_{i_k} & \end{pmatrix} = (1, \ldots, n+m)\right\}$$

$$= 2^k$$

□

Lemma 39. *The following two are equivalent:*

1. *A and B have exactly k common roots.*
2. *$N_R = 2^k$.*

Proof. Lemma 38 gives $1 \implies 2$. Thus it remains to show $2 \implies 1$. Assume that $N_R = 2^k$. Let λ be the number of common roots of A and B. Then from Lemma 38, we have $N_R = 2^\lambda$. Thus $2^\lambda = 2^k$, and hence $\lambda = k$. Thus A and B have exactly k common roots. □

Lemma 40. *Let $\pi, \pi' \in S^*$. The following two are equivalent.*

1. *$\pi = \pi'$*
2. *$\mathbf{M}_\pi = \mathbf{M}_{\pi'}$*

Proof. Let $\pi = (\nu, \mu)\,,\ \pi' = (\nu', \mu') \in S^*$. It is obvious that $1 \implies 2$. It remains to show $2 \implies 1$. Assume $\mathbf{M}_\pi = \mathbf{M}_{\pi'}$. We will show that $\pi = \pi'$. Note

$$\mathbf{M}_\pi = \mathbf{a}_{\bar\nu_1} \cdots \mathbf{a}_{\bar\nu_n} \mathbf{b}_{\bar\mu_1} \cdots \mathbf{b}_{\bar\mu_m}$$
$$\mathbf{M}_{\pi'} = \mathbf{a}_{\bar\nu'_1} \cdots \mathbf{a}_{\bar\nu'_n} \mathbf{b}_{\bar\mu'_1} \cdots \mathbf{b}_{\bar\mu'_m}$$

where $\bar\mu_i = \mu_i - i$, $\bar\nu_i = \nu_i - i$, $\bar\mu'_i = \mu'_i - i$ and $\bar\nu'_i = \nu'_i - i$. Since $\pi \in S^*$ we have $0 \le \bar\nu_1 \le \cdots \le \bar\nu_n \le m$ and $0 \le \bar\mu_1 \le \ldots \le \bar\mu_m \le n$. The same with $(\bar\nu', \bar\mu')$. Thus all the coefficients are from $\mathbf{a}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_m, \mathbf{b}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_n$. Since $\mathbf{M}_\pi = \mathbf{M}_{\pi'}$, we have $\bar\nu = \bar\nu'$ and $\bar\mu = \bar\mu'$, in turn, $\nu = \nu'$ and $\mu = \mu'$. Thus $\pi = \pi'$. □

Proof of Main Result (Theorem 15). First, we observe that, because of Proposition 7 and Lemma 17, we can restrict the proof to the case of monic polynomials. We will prove each direction of implication one at time.

- If A and B have exactly k common roots, then $O_{\mathbf{R}}(a, b) = k$.

  Assume that A and B have exactly k common roots. From Lemma 39, we have $N_R = 2^k$, that is, we have 2^k different π's such that $R = M_\pi$. From Lemma 29, those π's are all from S^*. From Lemma 40, they correspond to 2^k distinct terms in $\mathbf{R}$. Hence $I_{\mathbf{R}}(a, b) = 2^k$. Thus $O_{\mathbf{R}}(a, b) = k$.

- If $O_{\mathbf{R}}(a, b) = k$, then A and B have exactly k common roots.

  Assume that $O_{\mathbf{R}}(a, b) = k$. Then $2^k \le I_{\mathbf{R}}(a, b) < 2^{k+1}$. From Lemma 29 and 40, we see that $2^k \le N_R < 2^{k+1}$. Since N_R is 2^λ for λ. We have $N_R = 2^k$. From Lemma 39, we conclude that A and B have exactly k common roots.

□

6 Conclusion and Discussion

The goal of this paper was to adapt the following well known property of univariate resultant over algebraically closed field to the tropical semifield: the number of common roots of the two polynomials is the same as the order of the resultant at the tuple of the coefficients. We have shown that the same property holds if we restrict the polynomials to be with simple and non-$\mathbf{0}$ roots. Let us discuss these restrictions one by one.

1. *non*-$\mathbf{0}$ root: Suppose that the two polynomial A and B have $\mathbf{0}$ as a root. The main result does not hold. The reason is as follows: each term of the polynomial $R(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ always contains, at least, one of the indeterminates $\mathbf{a}_m$ and $\mathbf{b}_n$. On the other hand, the fact that $\mathbf{0}$ is a common roots of A, B implies that $a_m = b_n = 0$. Thus, for every term t in R, we have $R(a, b) = t_i(a, b) = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore the order can be different from (in fact *not* related to) the number of common roots.

2. *simple* root: Suppose that a polynomial has a multiple (not simple) root. The main result does not hold. The reason is as follows: A function with a multiple root admits infinitely many polynomial representations. Furthermore the order of the resultant depends on which representation is chosen. Therefore the order can be different from the number of common roots.

It is not obvious how to extend/adapt the main result to the two non treated cases ($\mathbf{0}$ root, multiple root). We leave them as open challenge.

Acknowledgement. H. Hong (hong@ncsu.edu) is partially supported by US NSF 1319632. J.R. Sendra (rafael.sendra@uah.es) is partially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad under the Project MTM2014-54141-P.

References

[1] Yuval Bistritz and Alexander Lifshitz. Bounds for resultants of univariate and bivariate polynomials. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 432(8):1995–2005, 2010.

[2] T. Bogart, A. N. Jensen, D. Speyer, B. Sturmfels, and R. R. Thomas. Computing tropical varieties. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 42(1-2):54–73, 2007.

[3] T. Bogart, A. N. Jensen, D. Speyer, B. Sturmfels, and R. R. Thomas. Computing tropical varieties. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 42(1-2):54–73, 2007.

[4] Erwan Brugallé and Kristin Shaw. A bit of tropical geometry. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 121(7):563–589, 2014.

[5] Peter Butkovič. *Max-linear systems: theory and algorithms*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2010.

[6] David Cox, John Little, and Donal O'Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1997. An introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra.

[7] Carlos DAndrea, Teresa Krick, and Agnes Szanto. Subresultants in multiple roots. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 438(5):1969–1989, 2013.

[8] Alicia Dickenstein, Eva Maria Feichtner, and Bernd Sturmfels. Tropical discriminants. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20(4):1111–1133, 2007.

[9] Michel Gondran and Michel Minoux. *Graphs, dioids and semirings*, volume 41 of *Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces Series*. Springer, New York, 2008. New models and algorithms.

[10] Alexander Guterman and Yaroslav Shitov. Rank functions of tropical matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 498:326–348, 2016.

[11] Bernd Heidergott, Geert Jan Oldser, and Jacob van der Woude. *Max plus at work*. Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006. Modeling and analysis of synchronized systems: a course on max-plus algebra and its applications.

[12] Ilia Itenberg, Grigory Mikhalkin, and Eugenii Shustin. *Tropical algebraic geometry*, volume 35 of *Oberwolfach Seminars*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2009.

[13] Anders Jensen and Josephine Yu. Computing tropical resultants. *J. Algebra*, 387:287–319, 2013.

[14] G. L. Litvinov and S. N. Sergeev, editors. *Tropical and idempotent mathematics and applications*, volume 616 of *Contemporary Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014. Papers from the International Workshop on Tropical and Idempotent Mathematics (Tropical-12) held at the Independent University, Moscow, August 26–31, 2012.

[15] R. Loos. Generalized polynomial remainder sequences. In *Computer algebra*, pages 115–137. Springer, Vienna, 1983.

[16] Diane MacLagan and Bernd Sturmfels. *Introduction to Tropical Geometry*, volume 161 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 2015.

[17] Grigory Mikhalkin. Tropical geometry and its applications. In *International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II*, pages 827–852. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006.

[18] Shinsuke Odagiri. The tropical resultant. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, 84(7):93–96, 2008.

[19] Lior Pachter and Bernd Sturmfels. Tropical geometry of statistical models. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 101(46):16132–16137 (electronic), 2004.

[20] Jean-Eric Pin. Tropical semirings. *Idempotency, Publ. Newton Inst., Cambridge Univ. Press*, Vol. 11:50–69, 1998.

[21] George Salmon. *Lessons introductory to the modern higher algebra*. Forth edition. Hodges, Figgis, and Co., Dublin, 1885.

[22] Imre Simon. Recognizable sets with multiplicities in the tropical semiring. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 324:107–120, 1988.

[23] David Speyer and Bernd Sturmfels. Tropical mathematics. *Math. Mag.*, 82(3):163–173, 2009.

[24] Bernd Sturmfels and Ngoc Mai Tran. Combinatorial types of tropical eigenvectors. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 45(1):27–36, 2013.

[25] James Joseph Sylvester. On a theory of the syzygetic relations of two rational integral functions, comprising an application to the theory of sturm's functions, and that of the greatest algebraical common measure. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.*, 143(1):407–548, 1853.

[26] Luis Felipe Tabera. Tropical resultants for curves and stable intersection. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 24(3):941–961, 2008.